

REMARKS

Summary of the Amendment

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 17, 19, 20, 22-27, 29 and 30 will have been canceled and claims 14 and 28 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 14-16, 21 and 28 will be pending, with claims 14 and 28 being in independent form.

Present Amendment is Proper for Entry After Final

Applicant respectfully submits that the instant amendment is proper for entry after final rejection. Applicant notes that no question of new matter is presented nor are any new issues raised in entering the instant amendment of the claims and that no new search would be required. Moreover, Applicant submits that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, or at least in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to enter the instant amendment, consider the merits of the same, and indicate the allowability of the present application and each of the pending claims. Applicant notes, in particular, that claims 14 and 28 have been specifically amended to address the formal rejection noted in the Final Office Action. Furthermore, all of the claims which were not indicated to contain allowable subject matter have been canceled.

Summary of the Official Action

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-17 and 19-30 as being indefinite. The Examiner also rejected claims 17, 19, 20, 22-27, 29 and 30 over the
(P24671.00081980.DOC)

applied art of record. The Examiner indicated, however, that claims 14-16, 21 and 28 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if amended to overcome the indefiniteness rejection. By the present amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the objections and rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

Interview of November 2, 2006

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Keenan in the interview of November 2, 2006. In that interview, Applicant's representative pointed out, among other things, that the Section 112, 2nd paragraph rejection was improper because one having ordinary skill in the art, having read the specification and the drawings, would clearly understand what is being claimed. The Examiner agreed that the claims were fully supported by the specification and drawings, but suggested some minor clarifying amendments. Applicant's representative agreed to amend the claims to clarify certain features noted by the Examiner. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the Section 112, 2nd paragraph rejection, in view of such claim amendments.

The Indefiniteness Rejection, in Moot

Claims 14-17 and 19-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite on the basis of various asserted informalities.

By this Amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended in a manner which overcomes this basis of rejection.

While Applicant believes that the claims are sufficiently clear to one of ordinary skill in the art, Applicant has, in an effort to advance prosecution, amended the claims in a manner which is believed to fully consider and address the Examiner comments and concerns.

The claims find clear support in, e.g., the embodiment shown in Fig. 6.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Traversal of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Over Thatcher with Zatylny

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 17, 22, 24, 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US patent 3,276,610 to THATCHER in view of US patent 4,687,402 to ZATYLNY.

The Examiner acknowledged that THATCHER lacks, among other things, the features recited in the above-noted claims such as the recited longitudinally adjustable swivel arms. However, the Examiner asserted that this feature is taught in ZATYLNY and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of these documents. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

While Applicant disagrees with this rejection for the reasons already made of record, Applicant submits that this rejection is moot because the above-noted claims have been canceled.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the
{P24671 00081980.DOC}

above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Over Thatcher with Olson

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 19, 20, 23, 26, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over THATCHER in view of US patent 2,689,053 to OLSON.

The Examiner acknowledged that THATCHER lacks, among other things, the features recited in the above-noted claims such as the bent or curved section of the swivel arms. However, the Examiner asserted that this feature is taught in OLSON and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of these documents. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

While Applicant disagrees with this rejection for the reasons already made of record, Applicant submits that this rejection is moot because the above-noted claims have been canceled.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Allowable Subject matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indicating that claims 14-16, 21 and 28 contain allowable subject matter. Furthermore, because the formal rejection has been addressed, Applicant submits that pending claims 14-16, 21 and 28 should now be indicated as being allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 102 and 103 and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate allowance of each and every pending claim of the present invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention, as recited in each of the pending claims. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Further, any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary for consideration of this amendment to deposit account No. 19-0089.

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Markus RINDERKNECHT

Neil F. Greenblum
Reg. No. 28,394

Robert W. Mueller
Reg. No. 35,043

November 6, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191